

REMARKS

Claims 2-6 are currently pending in the present application. Amendment of certain claims are not to be construed as a dedication to the public of any of the subject matter of the claims as previously presented. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner rejected Claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by James et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,179,713). This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the amended claims.

As previously communicated, the present invention is directed to a gaming system between game terminals that are connected to a host computer, where the players of each video game terminal can play against other players in simulated real-time scenario by receiving and replaying the game play data of the other players. More specifically, the game play data of a player is first stored on the game terminal and then later transmitted to a host computer, which then transmits the stored game play data to the rest of the connected game terminals. The other game terminals then receive and replay the game play data (whether at the same time or at different times) while locally executing the game for the players of the game terminals in real time progression; as a result, two players can play against each other in such games as car racing in a pseudo real-time environment, even though they may be playing the game at different times. For instance, if the game is car racing, one player may first play the game by driving on the race track by herself; the replay data of that game play is transmitted to the host computer available for download by another player, who, upon execution of the replay data, can race against the first player in real time. Again, as previously mentioned, the present invention provides the ability for players around the world to play the same game in different times while providing simulated real-time experience of a multiplayer game.

James does not contain any disclosure or suggestion of a network of game terminals where each terminal includes storage means for saving game play data that are then transmitted to a host computer for replay in real-time progression, as recited in amended Claims 2 and 3. Rather, James is directed to what is known as “turn-based” games, such as Chess or mutli-player simulation games, wherein the nature of the game is one player makes one move at a time. James discloses recording the status of the game and the moves made by each player, and each player can check the status of the game and move the game forward from there. James simply does not disclose recording and executing replay data, which can then be executed to reproduce the game played by another player in real-time progression. The Examiner points to Col. 3, lines 61-65 and Col. 14, lines 34-38 as containing disclosure of playback means for playing back replay data; however, the cited sections only discusses recording and reproducing events that took place when a player took his or her turn, such as “blow-by-blow recording” of a battle scene, but does not execute a replay data for reproducing a player performance in an actual interactive game in real-time progression, a game in which a user can participate in. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2 and 3 are not anticipated by, nor obvious in view of, James.

The Examiner rejected Claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over James et al. in view of Ng (U.S. Patent No. 5,971,855). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, James does not disclose executing replay data in a real-time progression during an interactive game. Ng fails to make up for the deficiencies of James. As previously discussed, Ng is directed to a system for facilitating communication between a handheld device and other electronic systems. Ng simply does not contain any disclosure or suggestion of receiving game replay data and executing it in real-time progression. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully

submit that Claims 4 and 5 are not anticipated by, nor obvious in view of, James or Ng, either alone or combined.

The Examiner rejected Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over James et al. in view of Kaji et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,183,367 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, James does not disclose executing replay data in a real-time progression during an interactive game. Kaji fails to make up for the deficiencies of James. As also previously discussed, Kaji is directed to a communication system where multiple players are connected to form a communication network. While a host system 32 is provided for accessing data received from the connected devices, Kaji does not teach or suggest a host computer receiving replay data of a game from a game terminal and transmitting the data to the other terminals for reproduction in real-time progression. Rather, the data received by the host system 32 is simply game play data including packets of video and sound for enhancing three-dimensional video experience. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submit that Claim 6 is not anticipated by, nor obvious in view of, James or Kaji, either alone or combined.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Assistant Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. 497742000200. However, the Assistant Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: May 20, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

David T. Yang

Registration No.: 44,415

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

555 W. Fifth Street, Suite 3500

Los Angeles, CA 90013

(213) 892-5587

Attorneys for Applicant